This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

984h
0815
UC-NRLF
$B 273 882
YB 12732

GIFT OF
Class of 1900

9814L
O515

THE TRUTH ABOUT SOCIALISM

JAMES B. OSBORNE

COPYRIGHTED, 1912
JAMES B. OSBORNE, OAKLAND, CAL.

THE TRUTH ABOUT SOCIALISM

An Analysis of the Philosophy Enunciated in the Declaration of American Independence, as Compared with the Philosophy of Social-Democracy

by

JAMES B. OSBORNE

UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA

THE INTERNATIONAL PRESS
OAKLAND, CAL.
1912

Class of 1900

UNIV. OF
CALIFORNIA

PREFACE

The purpose of this little pamphlet is to remove the objection now in the minds of millions of people toward Socialism on the ground that Socialism is un-American.

Socialism is not incompatible with Americanism when Americanism is measured by the standard of the American Revolutionists. On the contrary, the Socialists are the only defenders in America to-day of that spirit in which this nation was born.

This pamphlet does not deal in any way whatsoever with the underlying economic causes of the American Revolution. Anyone desiring to take up this phase of the subject will be amply repaid by reading "*Social Forces in American History*," by A. M. Simons.

JAMES B. OSBORNE

June 10, 1912.

Rice Institute, Oakland, Cal.

886380

THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

In Congress, July 4, 1776.

The Unanimous Declaration of the Thirteen States of America.

When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assure, among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect for the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident; that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established, should not be changed for light and transient causes; and, accordingly, all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But, when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right—it is their duty—to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of these colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former systems of government.———

INTRODUCTORY PARAGRAPH

For many generations the Old World has looked to the United States with this question on all liberty-loving lips: "What is Americanism?"

Chapter I.

AMERICANISM

The best interpretation of Americanism was expressed in the tidal wave of democracy which swept the colonies just prior to and during the American Revolution, resulting in the boldest and most sweeping declaration of human rights and the highest ideals of popular government ever before proclaimed by any nation or any people.

Shortly after the American Revolution Dr. Benjamin Fanklin was dining with a distinguished Englishman and a well known Frenchman. It was proposed that each give a toast to his respective country. The Englishman spoke first: "Here's to Great Britain, the sun that gives light to all nations of the earth." The Frenchman responded: "And I toast France, ze moon that shines over half ze world where ze sun is not, and whose magic rays move ze tides of all ze shores." Dr. Franklin added: "Here's to George Washington, the Joshua of America, who commanded the sun and moon to stand still, and they stood still."

As a matter of fact, however, Mr. Edmund Randolph, secretary to Mr. Washington during the War of the Revolution, said that "the pen of Thomas Paine was a greater power to the Revolution than the sword of Mr. Washington." (Conway's *Life and Writings of Thomas Paine.*) Thomas Paine produced most of the revolutionary literature during the period preceding the Revolution and no publication ever before had such widespread circulation or such effect upon the public mind. Five hundred thousand copies of "*Common Sense*" alone were printed and distributed among the colonists. The idea was common among the American Revolutionists that their action in establishing independence for the colonies would be a blow against slavery, monarchy, aristocracy and privileged classes in all countries. They confidently expected that their example of revolt would point the path of power to the oppressed and struggling people of all nations of the world. And it is evident that the influence of the American Revolution in proclaiming

and promulgating the doctrine of democracy was felt all over the world, and profoundly so in France and England.

This idea is very forcibly expressed by Thomas Paine in "*Common Sense*" as follows: "It is not the concern of a day, a year, or an age. Posterity is virtually involved in the contest and will be more or less affected, even to the end of time, by these proceedings. Now is the seed time of continental union, faith and honor. The least fracture now will be like a name engraved with the point of a pin on the tender rind of a young oak; the wound will enlarge with the tree, and posterity will read it in full grown characters." Thomas Paine was the first man in America to advocate the abolition of chattel slavery, who at the same time proposed a plan for the solution of the slave problem. He not only advocated the abolition of chattel slavery, but advocated justice to woman in such an able manner that his arguments are today unanswerable by all of the opponents of equal suffrage. "*Common Sense*" by Thomas Paine was translated into many foreign languages and even more copies were sold in France and England than in the American colonies. His fearless philosophy had tremendous influence from New England to the Carolinas in moulding the opinions of patriots and awakening the social consciousness of the colonists. Washington placed Paine's "sound doctrine and unanswerable reasoning" on a level of importance with the "flaring arguments" which went up from the burning houses of Falmouth and Norfolk. "My countrymen" he wrote "will come reluctantly into the idea of Independence, but time and persecution bring wonderful things to pass and by letters which I have lately received from Virginia, I find *Common Sense* is working a powerful change in the minds of many." (From George Travillon's *History of the American Revolution.*) Undoubtedly the writings of Thomas Paine and his familiar acquaintance with Jefferson had considerable influence on the boldness of style of the Declaration of Independence written by Jefferson, but neither Paine nor Jefferson cared for credit or reward for their contributions to American Independence, and Jefferson showed that he was conscious of the fact that intelligence was social rather than individual in its nature, as will be seen by his reply to a criticism by John Adams. "The stock charge against the Declaration of Independence—repeated in a hundred shapes ever since it appeared in print—had been that it lacked originality, and that its author was a plagiarist. It was imitated, so we are informed, from the state papers of the Long parliament; it owed much to Locke, and much to Milton, and still more to Rousseau. More recent sources on which Jefferson had largely drawn were detected in a charge delivered to the Grand Jury of Charlestown in the Virginia Declaration of Rights. John Adams, great at great moments, but with a mind too active and uneasy for the

prolonged leisure of his latter days, six and forty years afterwards explained to a correspondent that there was nothing new in Jefferson's paper. Jefferson lived to see the letter of his colleague and his remarks on it were as sensible as they were good tempered and dignified. "I did not," he said, "consider it any part of my charge to invent new ideas and to offer no sentiment which had ever been expressed before." Had Mr. Adams been so restrained, congress would have lost the benefit of his bold and impressive advocations of the rights of the Revolution. For no man's fervid addresses more than his, encouraged and supported us through the difficulties which, like the ceaseless action of gravity, weighed on us by night and by day. Yet, on the same ground, we may ask which of his elevated thoughts were new, or can be affirmed never before to have entered the conceptions of man."

The American Revolutionists not only stood for the right of self-government for themselves, but for all men regardless of race and color. Whatever might have been the motive of some individuals participating in the American Revolution, it is unquestionably true that the majority of the American people were not only opposed alike to monarchy and slavery, but gave their approval gladly and enthusiastically to the social philosophy and democatic principles contained in the Declaration of Independence.

The material conditions, that is the economic and intellectual development of the American people in 1776, did not make possible the realization of the ideals of democracy held by the founders of the government, but many people in America and all over the world have since that time joined in the march of humanity toward democracy, and the economic and intellectual developments of the last century have prepared a material condition for the disappearance of privileged classes and the apearance of social democracy. Dr. Witherspoon, a delegate from New Jersey in the continental congress, said, that in his judgment "the country was not only ripe for Independence, but was in danger of becoming rotten for want of it." So it may be said to-day, that this country is not only ripe for Socialism, but is even becoming rotten for want of it.

The philosophies contained in the Declaration of Independence are the best expression of Americanism. It is what the people of 1776 believed in. It is what they fought for; it is what they thought they were leaving as a heritage to posterity and to the struggling peoples of the world. The original draft of the Declaration of Independence prepared by Thomas Jefferson and submitted to the Independence Convention contained a clause in opposition to chattel slavery, and a denunciation of the English king for fostering and protecting the slave traffic, and for vetoing bills passed by the colonists to prohibit said traffic. This

clause, left out of the original draft of the Declaration of Independence, can be found in Woodrow Wilson's *History of the American People*, Vol. 2, page 246, and Conway's *Life and Writings of Thomas Paine*, Vol. 1, page 80. While this clause was not adopted in the Declaration of Independence, it is certain that many of the influential men of the convention were in sympathy with it, and perhaps took it for granted that the abolition of slavery would follow as a natural consequence of American Independence.

Abraham Lincoln was fully aware of the attitude of the American Revolutionists on the slavery question, and in an address on John Brown delivered in Cooper Institute New York, Feb. 27, 1860, and to a degree in defense of John Brown's principles, but not his tactics, said: "True, we do, in common with our fathers, who framed the government under which we live, declare our belief that slavery is wong."

The Socialists of the United States, as well as in other countries, adhere to the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence. These philosophies are—first, freedom and equality; second, the only purpose of government is to secure life, liberty and happiness; third, that all just powers of government not derived from the consent of the governed are unjust powers; fourth, the right of revolution when any form of government becomes destructive of these principles.

Each of these philosophies will be treated in the following chapters.

CHAPTER II.

EQUALITY

The very first doctrine in the Declaration of American Independence proclaims the equality of all mankind. Freedom and equality are the essential fundamentals of democracy. It became necessary for the American Revolutionists as promoters of the democratic idea, and opponents of the divine right of kings, to give some reason, some explanation, in justification of their revolutionary course.

Up to the time of the American Revolution, the doctrine of the divine right of kings prevailed throughout the nations of the world. The following quotation from the speech of an English king conveys some idea of that doctrine: "That which concerns the mystey of the king's power is not lawful to be disputed; for that is to wade into the weaknesses of princes, and to take away the mystical reverence that belongs unto them that sit on the throne of God." (James I. in a speech made

in the star chamber on June 20, 1601. Quoted from Lee's *Source Book of English History*, page 336.)

The argument or philosophy used in justification of the divine right of kings is an assumption that some people are by nature superior to others; that some have innately superior talents or excellence, and that an all-wise Povidence, on account of the superior mind or ability of a certain individual, selects him to be king, and to rule over the rest of the people; and on account of the inferiority of the great mass of mankind, they become subjects of the king. This doctrine the American Revolutionists refused to accept, and proclaimed in the most sweeping terms the freedom and equality of all mankind.

There are but few in America to-day who would acknowledge that they believed in the divine right of kings to rule, and yet it is astonishing the great influence this doctrine has, even at the present time, upon our political organization.

The argument used to-day in justification of the ownership of colossal wealth by a few individuals is exactly the same in essence as the argument in times past and present in defense of the divine right of kings.

A few years ago, during a great coal strike in Pennsylvania, and at a time a coal famine seemed probable, propositions were made by the government looking to government interference, and, if necessary, government operation of the mines. At this juncture, Mr. Baer, representing the coal barons, came to the rescue, and publicly proclaimed that on account of his superior fitness and intelligence, that God Almighty had made him custodian of all the coal fields in the anthracite region.

The ordinary defender of class ownership of the material resources of social wealth production is seldom as bold or frank as the railway magnate, Mr. Baer. Nevertheless, in a final anaylsis the argument must, by the very nature of things, be based on the same philosophy, a dualist philosophy, out of which can be deduced the proposition that some men are by nature superior to other men, with greater minds and excellence, and, therefore, entitled to greater recognition and greater compensation than the great mass of mankind who, by nature, are inferior. Hence this philosophy of the divine right of kings used in 1776 in defense of King George has become the only philosophy used in defense of modern capitalism.

The Declaration of American Independence proclaimed a denial of this philosophy of the innate superiority of some and the innate inferiority of others, and proclaimed the monistic and democratic philosophy of the equality of all mankind. The doctrine of equality, however, was a new doctrine, based on a new philosophy, a revolutionary philosophy, and has not yet been thoroughly absorbed by the American people nor by any

other people. Nevertheless, just in proportion as we march toward democracy, we must accept and apply the doctrine of equality.

The doctrine of the divine right of kings applies to the nobility, the aristocracy and the ruling class in all countries of the past. Mankind has been taught for centuries and in all countries, the doctrine of supeiority and inferiority among men. Perhaps no country has longer or with greater effect taught this doctrine than has the Empire of China. The Chinese have been taught for centuries that they were a superior people, that the humblest Chinaman was superior to persons of other nationalities simply by virtue of being a Chinaman, so the Chinese call themselves "Celestials."

In England, the people have been taught that England is the greatest country in the world, and that Englishmen have greater excellence than any other people. In America we have been taught the same doctrine, that Americans by virtue of the fact that they were born in the United States, makes them superior to all other people. Here in California we even claim that a native son or daughter has some distinguishing characteristics of superiority over people born in other states

This doctrine of the ruling class is the only bulwark in defense of class rule, and is the foundation for modern jingoism and false patriotism. If the people of China accept the doctrine of their superiority over the rest of mankind, it then becomes easy for them to accept the rule of the so-called superior class over the great majority. This is equally true of every other great nation. If we accept the doctrine in America that Americans are superior to all other people, then the next step in harmony with the same view point is the acceptance of the doctine that some Americans are superior to others, and on account of their superiority are entitled to greater recognition and compensation.

Every apologist, defender or retainer of the capitalist class defends capitalist class ownership of the wealth of this nation on the one ground of the superiority of the capitalist class over all other classes. Ask any of them if they believe that Mr. Morgan, Mr. Carnegie and Mr. Rockefeller are entitled to the great wealth they own? Any one of them will answer, "Yes." Then if you ask on what ground, the answer will be "on account of their superior minds, their greater excellence." In other words, a billionaire's wealth is just compensation for his superior mind, and that the poverty of the great mass of people is on account of their inferior brain power.

Notwithstanding this doctrine was denounced by the founders of this republic, it is astonishing the influence that it still has in the minds of the people. It has been taught for centuries; it is taught to-day in the schools, in the churches, in the newspapers, on public platforms, and is still the psychological foundation for class rule. Children are being

taught to get an education so that they will have an advantage over the uneducated and receive greater compensation than their less fortunate fellows. It is generally accepted today that the professional or educated classes are entitled to greater compensation for their services than the ordinary laborer. It is urged that on account of their education and professional training they are superior, and their services to society of greater value than the services of those following so-called menial occupations. This is as much of a fallacy as the doctrine of the divine right of kings, and springs from identically the same foundation. The fact is that wealth is a social and not an individual product. Likewise, we can only value service from a social rather than an individual viewpoint.

If we hire a doctor, we think fifty dollars a day a reasonable price. If we hire a sewer digger, we think three dollars a day exorbitant; and yet if the people of any community had to decide by popular vote this question, shall we get along without sewer diggers, sewers and sanitary conditions and retain our physicians, or will we dispense with physicians and retain the sewer diggers and sanitary conditions, the vote would be almost unanimous to retain the sewer digger. Fortunately, we do not have to decide that question, but since both the physician and the sewer digger are socially useful, who can determine who should receive the greater compensation? *Herein lies the argument for economic equality, without which, equality of opportunity is a meaningless phrase.* Wealth is a social product; education is social in its origin as well as in development. Thomas Jefferson evidently understood this argument in relation to education. He was criticized in the production of the Declaration of Independence, as has been noted in a previous chapter. But his answer to the criticism of John Adams, that there was nothing new or original in the Declaration of Independence is worth reading again in connection with the argument for equality, as it answers all of the arguments that can be made in favor of greater compensation on the ground of greater or superior education. Mr. Jefferson took the position that if Mr. Adams, or any other man, had to use only ideas, thoughts or intelligence, entirely his own, his service to society would be exceedingly limited. Emerson says in his *Essay on History*, "There is one mind common to all individual men. Every man is an inlet to the same and to all of the same."

To-day, in the United States, for every man or woman that goes through a university, nine hundred and ninety-nine men and women have to stand aside to make the higher education possible for the one, and under modern conditions the one has an advantage over the nine hundred and ninety-nine that made the advantage possible. It is easy to see that if the entire thousand could have had the university education, the ad-

vantage of the one would not have arisen. If all the people had an equal opportunity to all the education society could afford, this question would solve itself. So, every approach toward economic equality is an approach toward intellectual democracy.

The argument for human equality is not an argument against human differentiation. Differentiation seems to be a universal law. No two leaves of the forest, so we are told, are just equal, or no two blades of grass just exactly the same length or color, and it is well for mankind that we have so much differentiation in nature. And it is well that we have so much human differentiation. We could not all very well make a living by playing a violin, or piano; yet we greatly appreciate the talents and excellence of a good musician. We could not all make a living as orators, yet we are aroused and swayed and made to deeply appreciate the great orator. We need all talents of all varieties, and we should be thankful for each variety or gradation of variety. Harriet P. Morse on this point recently said: "We need the agitator, without whom the waters of civilization would become stagnant; the crank, without whom there would surely be nothing new under the sun; the peacemaker, who rectifies troubles that he never caused; the musician who lifts us to mightier and loftier realms; the great writer, who provides us with companionship we otherwise could not know; the artist, who gives us insight; the poet, who calms and soothes us; the teacher, who imparts knowledge and inspiration; the orator, who puts great truths into pleasing and lasting forms; the idealist, who gives us glimpses of the new heaven and the new earth which are to be; the organizer, who moulds ineffective parts into an effective whole; the inventor, who lessens our labors and increases our rewards; the toiler, *without whom all the rest could not be.*"

Every normal human being has the potentiality of excellence in the performance of some necessary social service, and the time is not far distant when we will have social ownership of the entire social product, and when all the progress made as the result of discovery, invention, science and education, will likewise be appropriated for the benefit of society instead of a privileged class. As throwing some light on this point we quote the following from J. Allen Smith (*Spirit of American Government,*" pp. 399-400.): "All new ideas have to be harmonized with much that is old. As at first accepted they are only partially true. A new philosophy requires time before its benefits can be fully realized. It must pass through a process of adaptation by which it is gradually modified, broadened and brought into orderly relations with life in general."

The theory of industrial freedom has during the nineteenth century been passing through just such a stage of development. The contention of Adam Smith and his followers that the mere desire for gain would of

itself insure adequate regulation of industry, is certainly not true under existing conditions. Natural law is not as he assumed, always beneficent in its operation. It is just as liable to produce harm as benefit unless it is regulated, controlled and directed by appropriate human agencies. It needs no argument to convince one that this is true so far as the forces of the physical world are concerned. Gravitation, steam and electricity contributed nothing to human progress until man discovered the means whereby they could be harnessed and controlled. Material civilization means nothing else than the development of control over and the consequent utilization of the materials and forces of the physical world. Another quotation from the same author and the same book shows the foundation for the economic inequalities in modern society. Such economic inequalities also become the foundation for the intellectual conception of the natural superiority of some men over other men. "The material environment is no longer the common possession of the group. It has become private property and has passed under the control of individuals in whose interest the laws and customs of every community, ancient or modern, have been largely modeled. This is a fact which all history attests."

In a society like the United States where a few possess greater fortunes than has hitherto been known, and millions of the people live in abject poverty, a society in which we have a thousand economic gradations all the way from the billionaire on one end to the hobo on the other, the public mind has been susceptible to the dualist philosophy that the human mind was not of one kind, that the human brain was divided on class lines, on race lines, and on sex lines. Hence we have been taught that the brain of a capitalist was made of different material than that of a workingman, and that the brain of a man was made of different material than the brain of a woman; that the mind of a male was superior to that of a female. This doctrine is the foundation of every argument against equal suffrage; likewise it is the only defense of the economic inequalities of modern civilization.

The American billionaire considers himself in an entirely different class from those who are ordinary millionaires. In his mind he is entirely superior to them. The ordinary millionaire is likewise impressed with his superior excellence in comparison with the man worth only a hundred thousand dollars. The owner of a hundred thousand dollars considers himself entirely above the man worth five thousand dollars, and some of the five thousand dollar men imagine that they are just about the wisest, cutest and most important personages that an all-wise Providence has endowed with guardianship. They imagine themselves entirely superior to, and as belonging to a class different from the best paid wage workers such as bricklayers or locomotive engineers, and in their turn the brick-

layer and engineer think they are better than the hod carrier or the fireman. Likewise the fireman thinks he is of more importance than the brakeman, and the brakeman on a first-class train thinks he is superior to a brakeman on a second-class train, and the brakeman on a second-class train thinks he is of an entirely different human variety from the porter on the train. The porter sees the section men at work and his proud bosom swells as he contemplates his superior excellence over that of a section man. The hobo comes along and the section man in his turn is enthused in contemplating his immense wisdom and high station over that of the hobo—the fellow that has no job at all, and even among the hoboes, we have varieties or gradation; the yegg, the gaycat and the blanketstiff. The yegg is conscious of his superiority over the other two varieties, and the gaycat considers himself of an entirely different class from the blanketstiff; and even among the blanketstiff variety some of them are so stuck-up that they refuse to speak to another blanketstiff when they meet him on the road. Down below these is the man, who, being unable to force recognition from society of his superior mind, opposes equal suffrage in the hope that he will be able to compel his wife to acknowledge the superiority of the male over the female mind.

The philosophy of social democracy, however, is making tremendous strides and is having a far-reaching effect upon the intellectual development, and when the Socialist program is applied, establishing the collective ownership and democratic management of all means of social wealth production, we will approach to the realization of that equality proclaimed by our forefathers in the Declaration of Independence. Every approach toward democracy in its last analysis must be an approach toward economic equality, and modern Socialism is the only tendency in that direction.

CHAPTER III.

PURPOSE OF GOVERNMENT

The founders of American government declared that the only purpose of government was to secure life, liberty, and happiness to all people. Today every American citizen knows, if he is at all informed, that this is not the purpose of the government of the United States, nor of the governments of the states. The government today is practically a committee to execute the will of the propertied classes, big business in the city, state and nation. The ideal of modern capitalistic society is profit—dollars

and dimes—and this idea has more complete sway in America than in any other country in the world. Capitalism goes marching, burning on, consuming on its altar of insatiate greed, the ideals of life, liberty and equality, and converts all that has hitherto been sacred, as well as the lives of the majority of men, women and children, into cold, callous cash as profits on vested interest.

The Declaration of Independence makes life and liberty for all the people more important than consideration of property interests. Capitalism and capitalist government makes life the cheapest thing in the world, and the protection of property and property interests its only vital consideration. A representative of congress in the state of Washington delivered a Fourth of July oration at Vancouver, in 1908, supposedly in commemoration of the Declaration of Independence, saying, "You may deny the rights of property to-day, but property will deny your right to life to-morrow." And yet there is not a word in the Declaration of Independence about property rights. This public man, like many others, on each Fourth of July makes speeches in denunciation of the ideals of Americanism for which the founders of the republic fought. Such denunciations are received with great pleasure by the owners of great wealth and privilege—the dominant economic class who own and control the means of life for the great mass of people.

When a man owns and controls that which I must have in order to live, he just as completely controls my life as if I were his chattel. Under the industrial conditions of today, one man, by his ownership of material instruments of social wealth production, can say to tens of thousands, "Go!" and they go; "Come!" and they come; life is becoming a burden to millions, and the word "liberty" a mere mockery, and the ordinary Fourth of July oration an insult to the memory of those illustrious Americans who pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor for the freedom and equality of all mankind. The only real issue in America to-day is, shall this government be an instrument of protection to colossal wealth and special privilege of American plutocracy, at the expense of the life, liberty and happiness of the majority of the men, women and children of the nation; or, shall this government represent the spirit of 1776, and *secure* the life. liberty and happiness of the people, if necessary, even at the expense of wealth and privilege. And the citizens of this country are now called upon to decide on which side of this issue they will stand. There is no middle ground or compromise possible. The wage working class of this country at the present time can be relied upon to be on the side of life and liberty, not because they are better than any other part of society, but because they have no vested interests or profits to protect. By the very nature of their environment, life, full, free and joyous, is their ideal. They are compelled to struggle for life; use, not

profit, is their social maxim; social service instead of social plunder is their shibboleth; manhood and womanhood their goal, because it is all they have, and all of the revolutionary elements in society are now rapidly joining the working class in the Socialist movement, and will sooner or later overwhelm the forces of reaction now in complete control of the various states of the nation.

Likewise, by the very nature of their environment, the class of proprietors, or the capitalist class, can be depended upon to oppose every tendency to undermine what they will call the sacred rights of property. They are riding on the backs of labor and will not dismount until invited. They enjoy special privileges and will not relinquish them until forced to do so. No ruling class ever did. All ruling classes have ever been the conservative and reactionary forces in any society opposing progress and every extension of popular rights. The capitalistic class and their spokesman in America today assumes the same attitude towards Socialism as did King George and the Tories towards American Revolutionists. But humanity has again begun its march; the river of progress, temporarily dammed up, again takes its course. The marvelous power of productive development of the last century, the unprecedented development of mechanical and inventive genius of man, combined with the general diffusion of scientific knowledge, compulsory education and the amazing increase of the stupendous organization of machine production, have laid a foundation for the abolition of poverty and privilege, and the appearance of a Comrade World, and Industrial Democracy, in which an injury to one would be the concern of all.

CHAPTER IV.

POWERS OF GOVERNMENT —HOW DERIVED

The principle of self-government as enunciated in the Declaration of Independence is a doctrine of the sovereignty of all the people. That is to say, that the people collectively shall be the supreme authority. That the collective will in city, county, state or national government should be the supreme law. This doctrine is an assumption that the public good and general welfare can be best promoted and protected by the people themselves. This places the will of the majority above that of the representatives, senators, and governors, presidents or judges. Cer-

tainly no one could wish for a broader or more complete idea of political democracy than this.

While the Constitution of the United States, (to be dealt with in a chapter to follow,) was an endeavor to nullify this doctrine of self-government, this spirit of democracy has manifested itself from time to time and has always had adherents in every part of the country, and is opposed today only by that part of the people who have inherited the monarchical idea that what is called the better elements in society should rule. Even such well-known American statesmen as Clay, Calhoun and Webster, are represented to have held this view, and every spokesman of the ruling class hold and defend it to-day. Ex-President Roosevelt not long ago attacked this philosophy of self-government, and said, in the "Outlook" Magazine, that "the framers of the Declaration of Independence were mistaken," and President Taft, in his veto message to Congress on the bill granting statehood to Arizona and New Mexico, not only voiced his sentiments in opposition to the right of the people to recall judges, but also repudiated the idea of self-government.

David J. Brewer, in *World's Best Orations*," says: "Webster, Clay and Calhoun occupied common ground in their descent from Benton's theory that the 'better element' of the community is apt to give the worst results when it is trusted to govern the rest. This theory was involved in Jefferson's teachings, but it did not come into actual and wide collision with the stately patriotism of the gentlemen of the colonial and revolutionary period until such of them as survived in 1828 saw Jackson with Benton at his back ready to force issues in its behalf, as they had never been forced before in any English-speaking country."

Andrew Jackson was undoubtedly a believe in the democratic principles of the Declaration of Independence, and the turbulent political conditions of his administration and the manner in which he was assailed by privilege is some evidence of the truth of his adherence to the principles of self-government. About the time of Jackson's administration, the German philosopher, Professor Hegel, very correctly accounted for the democratic appearance of the American government in the early years of its existence, and at the same time gave an interpretation of the reason why we do not have a semblance of democracy to-day. Under the title of *Philosophy of History*, p. 141, in Collier's edition of *Library of Universal Literature*, Hegel says: "As to the political condition of North America, the general object of the existence of the state is not yet fixed and determined, and the necessity for a firm combination does not yet exist, for a real state and a real government arrive only after a distinction of classes has arisen, when wealth and poverty become extreme, and when such a condition of things presents itself that a large

portion of the people can no longer satisfy its necessities in the way it has been accustomed to do."

The Socialists favor and use such measures as the referendum, initiative and recall, and all other measures calculated to extend the political power of the people; and at the same time, we point out that a political democracy never existed where a small percentage of the population owned three-fourths of the nation's wealth, and the majority of the people were propertyless. Under such conditions the essential material elements for democracy do not exist. The overwhelming majority of all legislation, decisions of courts, and acts of governments pertain to property. Ralph Waldo Emerson, in his *Essay on Politics*, says: "All laws pertaining to property will be made by property." Our experience in the United States is ample proof of Emerson's statement. Laws pertaining to the banking business are passed by Congress, but are in reality made by bankers. Railroad legislation passed by State Legislatures or Congress is made by railroads. Insurance laws are made by the insurance companies and so on throughout all laws of property interests, and so long as the nation's wealth is within the hands of a few, these few will, in reality, be the government.

The ideals held by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Taft, and all leaders of both democratic and republican parties, who hold that government is instituted to protect property regardless of life or liberty are opposed to even an approach to democracy. Adam Smith, in his *Wealth of Nations*, says: "Civil government, so far as it is instituted for the security of property, is in reality instituted for the defense of the rich against the poor, or of those who have some property, against those who have none at all."

The insurgents, or progressive republicans, propose to solve the problems of domination and supremacy of the trusts and colossal wealth, by passing measures to limit the power to combine, and appointing commissions to regulate and control stupendous industries and commercial organizations. All such methods will prove worse than useless. The progressive republicans and radical democrats in regard to the problems of to-day occupy about the same position as did the Douglas democrats, and the Missouri Compromise advocates in regard to the slavery question, and the Socialists occupy a similar position to that of the Abolitionists. To-day class ownership of the natural resources, of the material instruments of social wealth production, makes at least one-half of the American people, men, women and children, wage slaves, just as helpless, but affording greater possibilities of exploitation than did the slaves of the South.

To say that we will not extend slavedom will not solve the problem, for this slavery will extend as long as the ownership of the means of production is invested in a class. To say that we will control this slavery

will not mitigate it in any way. We can increase the powers of the interstate commerce commission, or the powers of city or state public utilities commissions, and regulate rates as we will; the fact will remain that arising from the ownership of the means of production, the owners have power to appropriate the entire product of labor, all the benefits of progress, discovery, invention and science, and to retain the entire working class as a commodity, yet the traffic in the bodies and souls of men, women and children will still continue, and the reward of labor will be the price of a miserable existence.

Before we have a government for the people, of the people, and by the people, wage slavery will have to be abolishd. Wage slavery cannot be abolished without the abolition of the class ownership of the material means of production. This the Socialists alone propose to do through the legal political process. This does not mean that we favor the destruction of any wealth. On the other hand, it means that the ownership of property in the means of social production by the capitalistic class, makes the ownership of property in the product of their labor impossible to the majority of the American people. The transformation of capitalistic property—that wealth used in social poduction into the collective wealth of the people—will emancipate labor from wage slavery, and at the same time wipe out all special privilege now enjoyed by the capitalistic class, and make it possible for all citizens to become proprietors, to appropriate the full product of their toil, and have an equal chance to appropriate the advantages of an ever-advancing civilization. As the small group of people to-day who, by their ownership of those things that all society must use in order to live, is in reality the government, so, when the people collectively own and control all these things upon which their collective life and well-being depend, the people collectively will be the government.

This is the Socialistic program, and it is the only program that will make possible the realization of the principles of self-government, the disappearance of class and class rule, and the realization of the dream of Mr. Jefferson, "equal opportunity to all, special privileges to none."

CHAPTER V.

THE RIGHT OF REVOLUTION

One of the principles of government upon which this nation was founded is the principle of revolution. The foundation of every doctrine taught in the Declaration of Independence is freedom and equality. Upon that doctrine is based the theory that the purpose of government is

to secure the life, liberty and happiness of all men, and likewise the theory that every just power of government must be derived from the consent of the people. The principle of revolution was added as a safeguard to the other principles of government proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence. Therefore we are told that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these principles—freedom, equality, life, liberty, happiness, or the authority of the people collectively—then it becomes the duty of the people to alter or abolish that form of government, and to institute a new government, laying its foundation, and organizing its form in such a manner as seems most likely to effect their safety and happiness. This is the basis of the doctrine of revolution adhered to by the American Revolutionists, and still adhered to by every American imbued with the spirit in which this nation was founded.

Thomas Jefferson defended the right of revolution in his first inaugural address, taking office as president of the United States, speaking ing of certain rights that should be maintained at all costs. He named the following as such: Free and fair elections participated in by all the people, and the sword of revolution where peaceful methods are not provided." John Adams, speaking in defense of revolution, said: "The furnace of affliction produces refinement in states as well as individuals." Daniel Webster, in his debates with Mr. Hayne, of South Carolina, quoted Blackstone to prove that revolution was a civil right. Wendell Phillips and Abraham Lincoln were both champions of the principle of revolution. Mr. Lincoln, on this subject, said: "This country, *with its institutions*, belongs to the people who inhabit it. Whenever they shall grow weary of the existing government, they can exercise their constitutional right of amending it, or their revolutionary right to dismember or overthrow it. Why should there not be a patient confidence in the ultimate justice of the people. Is there any better or equal hope in the world?"

Only the Socialists and those in sympathy with them are to-day defending this principle, as did Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Jefferson and the early American patriots. Therefore the Socialists are opposed by the ruling class to-day as the American Revolutionists were opposed by royalty and aristocracy, and as Lincoln was opposed by the slave owning aristocracy.

One of the doctrines of the American Revolutionists was that "when protection is withdrawn, allegiance should cease." Should the American people adopt that rule to-day, that is, give our allegiance to the government only to the extent that the government affords protection to life, liberty and happiness, the allegiance of a great majority would be withdrawn. I do not intend here to recite in detail the grievances of the American people against the class character of the American govern-

ment. The grievances of the American Revolutionists or the contumely borne by them was practically nothing in comparison to the exploitation, poverty and degradation borne patiently by the working class of the twentieth century. The American Revolutionist did not have to send his children to mill, mine, shop and factory. To-day the number of child laborers in the United States is equal to the entire population at the time of the American Revolution. The American Revolutionist did not have to send his wife out as a wage worker, nor his daughter to work for a pittance in any department store, nor was he called upon to furnish from his fireside five hundred thousand inmates for houses of ill repute. All of this is borne by the American working class to-day. The American Revolutionist had free access to the land. To-day this is denied to three-fourths of the population. The American Revolutionist could work for himself or find an employer. To-day there are millions of people unable to find employment at all, and the very nature of capitalistic production produces a large army of unemployed, and, to hundreds of thousands of these life has become a burden, and to millions of them the word "liberty" is a mere mockery. Therefore the Socialists proclaim a revolution; not a revolution of violence, but a revolution just the same.

Revolution is not something apart from evolution, but is a part of evolution. If you would, by force, open a rose bud before the evolutionary process had prepared for the revolutionary cisis of blooming, you would produce a reaction and not a revolution. Likewise, if you were to open an egg in process of hatching several days before the evolutionary process was complete, you would produce a reaction, not a revolution. The revolutionary action in breaking an egg shell or the bursting of a rosebud must be at the time when the evolutionary process has thoroughly prepared the way for the revolutionary action.

The Socialists hold that no old society has ever passed away until it has developed all the productive forces for which there was room within the old society, and that no new society has ever arisen until the material conditions for its existence have been developed out of the womb of the old society. Accordingly the Socialists propose only those changes that are compatible with the economic and intellectual development of society at the time the change is proposed; and this is the basis from an evolutionary and scientific standpoint of a social revolution so frequently referred to by the Socialists.

The material conditions for the disappearance of capitalism and the appearance of a new social order have already developed within capitalist society in the United States. The development of all the productive forces for which there is room within the present society has

been more completely accomplished in America than in any other country of the world.

In the latter part of the eighteenth century, Malthus, an English political economist, pointed out that the population of the earth was increasing at a greater ratio than our ability to produce wealth, and that if pestilence did not destroy the lives of millions of the population, that the nations would be compelled to go to war with one another and kill enough of the people in order that the remaining part of the population might have sufficient food, clothing and the necessities of life. The problem of that period was the problem of production, or how to increase the productive forces. The development of the forces of modern production has not only solved that problem, but is forcing all the great nations of the world to-day to grapple with the problem of consumption. "How can we get a market for what we have the ability to produce," is the economic problem which chiefly concerns the statesmanship of every country. This problem cannot be solved by wars of commercial conquest, nor by any kind of tariff legislation; nor can it be solved by any kind of reformed legislation calculated to place limitations upon the power of gigantic corporations. There is only one solution of the great economic problem of our nation—the problem of consumption. The solution is to increase the consumptive capacity of the people until the consumptive capacity equals their productive capacity. This can be done by removing the limitations now placed upon the consumptive ability of the great majority of people. To illustrate, out of every five million dollars' worth of wealth produced by the working class in America, the working class receive in wages only one million. Hence, they can consume only one-fifth of their total product. The capitalist class, who receive four-fifths of the total wealth production are numerically too small to consume very much. The only solution, therefore, to the economic problem of this nation is the abolition of the wage system, and as the wage system arises from the capitalist class ownership of the means of production, it follows that the social revolution in all countries must mean the abolition of the class ownership of the material instruments of social wealth production, and a substitution of collective ownership and democratic management of all means of social wealth production.

This is the revolution. The program of the Socialist, for its accomplishment is to unite the working class and all in sympathy with the working class into a political party separate and distinct from all parties of the capitalist class. Thus organized, the working class wages the class struggle in city, county, state and nation. First, the Socialist will take possession of the political power in cities and counties, and this power will be the basis of the conquest of the political power of the states

and nation. When the political power of the nation falls into the hands of the Socialist, the Socialist will then transform capitalist property in the means of production into collective wealth. They will then have power to give legal sanction to this act. The Socialist Party, then, is the legal and constitutional program of the revolutionary movement of the twentieth century. Socialism is the only solution of the economic problem of the nations, and is the only road to democracy. All of the economic development of the past, all the forces of social evolution, all the knowledge arising from the development of modern physical science, as well as the dynamic force of the class struggle, makes certain the disappearance of class rule forever, and the appearance of social democracy.

The United States, on account of material conditions, should be the first country in the world to solve this economic problem. It should, therefore be the first country in the world to begin the inauguration of the social revolution that will transform capitalist society into an associated humanity. The founders of this republic were the first to proclaim the principles of freedom and equality for all mankind. Let the Socialists of America cause this nation to be the first to lead the world in the realization of what was but a dream in the eighteenth century.

Judge Gary, Cardinal Gibbons and Governor Woodrow Wilson, each are of the opinion that we are about to have another French revolution. Thanks to the Socialists this catastophe will be averted. Any form of violence is incompatible with the intellectual development of the twentieth century. The use of any form of violence in the United States at the present time could only produce reaction, not revolution.

The Socialist propaganda has been the most potential factor in the development of the social concept, and the social revolution not only includes every country, but the last man in every country. The social revolution liberates the means of life from private ownership and frees the mind as well as the body of all mankind. It will free society from class rule, class struggles, and the acts of violence arising therefrom.

The social revolution is on now; it is the greatest thing in the world, and to its successful and peaceful accomplishment all Socialists pledge their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

CHAPTER VI.

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE REVOLUTION

"The American Revolution was a supreme effort on the part of the American colonists to establish a democracy -- a government in which the will of the people would be supreme. And for a time the democratic spirit manifested itself and some of the early town governments were local democracies. Some of the state constitutions adopted prior to the federal constitution, likewise, expressed the same idea of sovereignty of the people without any constitutional checks or curbs. However, the convention which prepared the constitution of the United States came as a reaction of the revolution and was clearly an endeavor on the part of its framers to check, stifle, and nullify all the possibilities of popular government fought for by the American Revolutionists. At the time of the revolution, perhaps one-third of the population were in sympathy with royalty and aristocracy. They were the men in public office under the king, their wealthy and influential friends, Tories, and aristocrats. The farmers, who had fought to make independence possible, at the close of the war found themselves in a deplorable financial condition, and were compelled to set themselves to the task of making a living for themselves and families. At this juncture, the Tory influence became active, and when the convention was called in 1787 to amend the Articles of Confederation, the element which had opposed the revolution seemed to be in complete control, and none of the most prominent men of the revolution were delegates. Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Paine, and such men were conspicuous only by their absence. The convention, instead of pursuing the business for which it was specifically called, assumed, without authority, the task of making a constitution for the United States government. The deliberations of said constitutional convention were kept a close secret by the members, and the public kept in total ignorance of the work of the body. This act within itself was not only enough to cast suspicion on the acts of the delegates, but was un-American, and unworthy of the men who claimed to represent anything in the semblance of the ideal of popular governments, and it was many years after the adoption of the Constitution before the public had access to the records of the Constitutional Convention. That the suspicions held, and the accusations hurled against the members of

the convention at that time are true have been amply attested by over a century's experience.

The United States Constitution was never ratified by popular vote of the people and it is certain that it would have been rejected if submitted to a popular vote. "Had the decision been left to what is now called the vote of the people, that is, to the mass of citizens all over the country, voting at the polls, the voice of the people would have probably pronounced against the Constitution." (American Commonwealth—Bryce.) That there was popular disapproval of the action of the Constitutional Convention in conducting its deliberations in secret and assuming powers not delegated to it is shown by a speech delivered by Mr. James Wilson before the Pennsylvania Convention in favor of the ratification of the Constitution. It will be seen that the only defense he gave of himself and his colleagues was to tell a humorous story to make the people laugh and thus detract their attention from the real issue. The extract from Mr. Wilson's speech referred to is as follows: "The business, we are told, which was entrusted to the late Convention was merely to amend the present Articles of Confederation. This observation has been frequently made, and has often brought to my mind a story that is related of Mr. Pope, who, as is well known, was not a little deformed. It was customary with him to use this phrase, 'God mend me,' when any little accident happened. One evening a link-boy was lighting him along and coming to a gutter the boy jumped nimbly over it,. Mr. Pope called to him to turn, adding, 'God mend me.' The arch-rogue, turning to light him, looked at him, and repeated, 'God mend you! He would sooner make a half dozen new ones." This would apply to the present Confederation, for it would be easier to make another than to amend this." (Elliott's *Debates*, Vol. 2, p. 470.)

The framers of the United States Constitution did not intend that instrument to provide for a democracy. "It has been common," says a late Justice of the United States Supreme Court, "to designate our form of government as a democracy, but in the true sense of which that term is properly used as defining a government in which all its acts are performed by the people, it is about as far from it as any other of which I am aware." (S. F. Miller, *Lectures on the Constitution of the United States*, pp. 84-85.) The Constitution, furthermore, did not provide for a republic. A republic is a form of government in which the legislative, executive and judicial powers are exercised by representatives of the people, said representatives being elected by the people and responsible to them.

The elaborate system of checks and curbs embodied in the Constitution was intended to take the power out of the hands of the people and place it in the hands of a select few who could be relied upon to protect

the rich and powerful minority against the poor but struggling majority.

Thus the Constitution has become the citadel of strength and power of corporate greed, public service corporations, and aggregated wealth used in the exploitation of manhood, womanhood, and childhood.

The Constitutional plan for placing all governmental power in the hands of the few for the protection of the rich is defended to-day by every apologist of the present social order. Judge William Howard Taft, while speaking before the American Bar Association in 1895, on "Recent Criticisms of the Federal Judiciary," spoke in part as follows: "While Socialism, as such, has not obtained much of a foot-hold in this country, schemes which are necessarily Socialistic in their nature are accepted planks in the platform of a large political party. The underlying principle of such schemes is that it is the duty of the government to equalize the inequalities which the rights of free contract and private property have brought about, and, by enormous outlay, derived as far as possible from the rich, to afford occupation and sustenance to the poor. However disguised such plans of social and governmental reform are, they find their support in the willingness of their advocates to transfer without compensation from one who has acquired a large part of his acquisition to those who have been less prudent, enegetic or fortunate. This, of course, involves confiscation, and the destruction of the principle of private property." (American Bar Association, 1895, p. 246.)

Modern critics of the Supreme Court would give us the impression that the federal judiciary are usurping power that was neither conferred nor implied by the framers of the Constitution. It will become apparent, however, to all those who care to investigate the matter that the powers exercised by the Supreme Court are in harmony with the general plan of checks provided in the Constitution for no other reason than to prevent popular government.

The Constitution provides a national House of Representatives, elected directly by the people, but the representatives of the people could not be trusted by the framers of the Constitution, so a United States Senate was provided for, not elected by the people, but by the State Legislatures. The only idea for the establishment of such a body was to place a balance against the will of the people, and, fearful they might occasionally enter into conspiracy with the House of Representatives to pass some law in the interests of the people as opposed to special privileges, provided the veto power to be placed in the hands of the president, a power not exercised by the king of England for over one hundred years; and finally, as the ultimate safeguard to protect the wealthy few against the interests of the majority, a Supreme Court was provided, also exercising the veto power in case both the legislative and executive departments of government should enter into said conspiracy,

and in order to remove this court entirely out of the reach of the public, they were to be appointed, and appointed for life. Thus the destruction of the spirit in which this nation was born became complete as far as the Constitution could make it. The powers exercised by the Supreme Court of the United States are by far greater than the power exercised by any similar body in any country in the world. Their power does not end in declaring acts of Congress null and void, but reaches out and destroys the principle of democracy in the various state governments as well. The Supreme Court not only passes upon the constitutionality of laws passed by the House of Representatives of the State Legislature concurred in by the Senate, signed by the Governor, and approved by the State Supreme Court, but goes even further, and is now passing upon the constitutionality of an act of the people of Oregon in establishing for themselves direct legislation through the initiative and referendum, constitutional amendments made by an overwhelming majority of the popular vote of that State. Thus the Supreme Court in passing its decision on the Oregon case at the same time passes upon the right of the people of every other state to amend their Constitution for the purpose of establishing direct legislation or any other measure decided by popular majority within the State.

(Note—Since writing the above paragraph the Supreme Court declined to pass upon the Oregon case at all; not because it did not have power to do so under the Constitution, but for the reason it did not care to exercise the powers vested in the Court by the Constitution just at this time when popular sentiment is demanding an extension of the democratic idea.)

While the United States Supreme Court has power to repress the expression of democracy in State governments, the State Legislatures likewise have the same power to curb the disposition of municipal democracy by the exercise of the veto power on city charters for local self-government. Thus we see the Constitution places all power at the top in order that the power at the bottom may be kept bound and gagged.

The question is, how long will the people consent to have their voices muffled and their feet manacled by an instrument deliberately framed for that purpose. William Lloyd Garrison, in his *Liberator*, as early as 1831, said: "The Constitution of the United States was a contract with hell, a compact with infamy."

J. Allen Smith, in his book, *Spirit of the American Government*," (p. 104), a book that every advocate of popular government should read—says: "It is easy to see in the exaltation of the federal judiciary a survival of the old mediaeval doctrine that the king can do no wrong. In fact, much the same attitude of mind which made monarchy possible may be seen in this country in our attitude toward the Supreme Court."

The makers of the Constitution made amendment to it almost impossible.

The abolition of the Senate, the withdrawal of the veto power from the president, the taking from the Supreme Court its unjust and unprecedented powers of passing upon the constitutionality of the acts of Congress or the right of the people to directly amend their State Constitutions by popular vote, and making it elective and directly responsible to the people, are Constitutional amendments that an overwhelming majority of the American people would vote for. But the Constitution cannot be amended by a majority of the people, nor a majority of the States; the provision to amend requires the action of three-fourths of the States.

The Constitution of the United States was conceived in secret, born of monarchical influence, and was not only a conspiracy against the liberty fought for by the American Revolutionists, but against the liberty of posterity as well, and if it cannot be amended so as to become an instrument of popular government and a defense of the majority in their struggle for life and liberty against the aggressions and tyranny of the wealthy few, then the necessities and intelligence of the people of the twentieth century will compel them to interpret the Constitution in the interests of humanity under the conditions of the twentieth century, or, if this is impossible, the people have the power to abolish it.

A decision of the State Supreme Court of Wisconsin rendered Nov. 16, 1911, passing upon the constitutionality of a workmen's compensation act, passed by the last session of the Legislature, gives expression to a thought that is not only timely, but that should be impressed on the minds of the people of all countries. Said decision was written by Chief Justice Winslow, and from it we quote as follows:

"When an eighteenth century Constitution forms the charter of liberty of a twentieth century government, must its general provisions be construed and interpreted by an eighteenth century mind, surounded by twentieth century conditions and ideals? Clearly not. This were to command the race to halt in its progress, to stretch the State upon a veritable bed of procrustes."

CHAPTER VII.

SOCIALISM AND THE AMERICAN FLAG

An appropriate summary of this little pamphlet could perhaps best be made by a short interpretation of the Stars and Stripes.

In previous chapters we have attempted to give an interpretation of real Americanism, and the Flag of the United States is emblematic of those principles adhered to by the founders of this government.

Since the Socialists are to-day the only real defenders of those principles, they likewise become the real defenders of the flag that represents those principles.

The capitalist class of the United States do not believe in a single principle represented by the American Flag. But on the other hand, use it to hide behind while they destroy every principle for which the Flag stands. Dr. Samuel Johnson once said: "Patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel." Experience in the United States in the last few years has proven this statement to be true.

The most intelligent Socialist, as well as all other intelligent men and women, are not much given to fetish worship. To-day it is not the emblem of a thing the people want, it is the thing itself; not the shadow, but the substance. The Socialists stand for everything represented by the Stars and Stripes, and will not be satisfied until they have all those things, not in theory merely, but in reality.

The blue field in the American Flag stands for equality, the stars in this blue field stand for the states; the equality of the states and the equality of all the people of all the states.

The white in the American Flag stands for the purity of the purpose of government, the purpose of government being life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness for all.

The red in the American Flag stands for brotherhood and typifies the blood shed by the American Revolutionists in their endeavor to establish liberty, equality and democracy.

The red Flag of Socialism represents exactly the same thing for all the world that the red in the Stars and Stripes stands for to the American citizen.

The red of the Stars and Stripes represents brotherhood and equality in the United States; the red flag of Socialism means that the blood of all men is red, and represents the brotherhood and equality of the people of all the world.

The triumph of Socialism in the United States can alone make possible the realization of those conditions of which the American Flag is only an emblem.

THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE STAMPED BELOW

AN INITIAL FINE OF 25 CENTS

WILL BE ASSESSED FOR FAILURE TO RETURN THIS BOOK ON THE DATE DUE. THE PENALTY WILL INCREASE TO 50 CENTS ON THE FOURTH DAY AND TO $1.00 ON THE SEVENTH DAY OVERDUE.

APR 27 1942
APR 26 1946

6Jan'62LU

REC'D LD

DEC 11 1961

LD 2

Photomount
Pamphlet
Binder
Gaylord Bros., Inc.
Makers
Stockton, Calif.
PAT. JAN. 21, 1908

YB 12732

886380

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY